

Giving the Devil His Dues.

Good Showmen.

Last week, in an editorial on this page, I said that if the drainage amendment was ratified the Times-Union would be largely responsible for it.

I wish to do justice even to the poor old Times-Union, so I will say, now that the drainage amendment is lost, that:

I THINK THE TIMES-UNION IS LARGELY RESPONSIBLE FOR IT.

It is the biggest newspaper in the State, more people read it than any other daily paper, more people know about it, more people discuss it.

It has been established forty years and it would be miraculous if in forty years of daily publication a newspaper should not have become known, quoted and read widely and extensively.

False doctrines repeated day after day, week in and week out, and reiterated again and again as the years roll by, **MAKE AN IMPRESSION** upon the human mind **BY SHEER FORCE OF REPETITION.**

Away back in the spring of the year the Times-Union commenced to print **WRONG VIEWS** about the drainage amendment. It **PRESENTED IT WRONG** to the people then, **IT PRESENTED IT WRONG** the day of election, and **IT PRESENTED IT WRONG** every day in the interval between those two dates.

When Charles H. Jones was editor of the Times-Union he was equally reckless in his statements as the editorial writers of that paper are now. It is true that Mr. Jones added to his recklessness conspicuous ability as a journalist and brilliancy as an editorial writer and I cannot follow up the comparison along these lines.

Jones had a habit of printing the news **EXACTLY AS IT SUITED HIM TO PRINT IT**, exactly as it was to **HIS INTEREST TO PRINT IT**, and hesitated not to put his neighbors in false positions.

He did this sometimes in so outrageous a manner that he was personally attacked on the streets. Some outraged citizen whom he had lied about would box his ears, for that was as far as a citizen could go, as he offered no resistance, and the **VERY NEXT DAY** Jones would print the same misrepresentations and falsities that he had printed the day before, and would continue to do so, until he had succeeded in making them pass as truths with a great many people.

Varnum, who founded and edited one of the component parts of the hyphenated Times-Union of the present day, did the same thing.

So the Times-Union is but living up to the traditions and rules and regulations laid down by its founders, when it adopts the course of misrepresentation, wilfully designed, **WHENEVER THE INTERESTS OF THOSE WHO OWN IT CAN BE SERVED BY THIS COURSE.**

In this matter of the drainage amendment no effort was made by the Times-Union to get at the facts in the case. No representative of the Times-Union ever visited the Statehouse, where the records are kept which would have made clear every phase of the question and where every step taken by the Trustees in administering the trust which the national government imposed upon them could be followed. No reporter of the Times-Union ever interviewed one of the Trustees with the declared purpose of finding out what **HIS** views of this question were. Shutting its eyes to the light which was at all times available to it, the Times-Union groped in the darkness of surmise in dealing with this question, determining what it would like to be the truth, and calling on the imagination of its writers to furnish plausible statements to maintain it.

Unfortunately for the people of this State there are many newspapers which, without disparagement, may be designated as country newspapers, that **HAVE NOT LEARNED**, and some which **CONVENIENTLY** forget, and others which **INNOCENTLY** forget, **WHAT THE TIMES-UNION IS AND WHAT IT STANDS FOR, AND HOW IT IS OWNED.**

These newspapers take their cue from the Times-Union. They reprint things which they see in its columns and pick up the line of treatment laid down in that paper, and thus become vehicles, innocently in some cases, but **FOR THEIR OWN SELFISH PURPOSES AND INTERESTS** in others, **FOR THE DISSEMINATION OF UNTRUTHS**, and the putting before the people **OF FALSE VIEWS OF PUBLIC QUESTIONS.**

Perhaps the most conspicuous example of this sort of thing in this drainage discussion was the cry that the Times-Union made that Broward favored the Louisville and Nashville Railroad at the expense of other railroads in the State, because the Louisville and Nashville Railroad contributed to his campaign fund.

It boldly and unblushingly accused the Governor of the State of making a deal inimical to the welfare of the people with this corporation. **IT HAD NOT ONE BIT OF EVIDENCE** for this statement.

On the contrary, it **KNEW** that Broward **HAD MADE NO DEAL.** It knew that the Louisville and Nashville Railroad opposed Broward's election as vigorously as all of the three railroad companies which owns the Times-Union did.

It picked up the bald statement of that most irresponsible person who edits the Tallahassee True Democrat, and paraded it in its columns as proof that a deal had been made with the Louisville and Nashville Railway by the trustees.

It kept this statement constantly before the people without giving any of the trustees an opportunity to deny it, without even going to one of them and propounding the simple question:

"Have you done this or not?"

The reason it did not do this was **BECAUSE IT KNEW WHAT THE ANSWER WOULD BE**, and was determined beforehand not to **PUT ITSELF IN JEOPARDY OF LEARNING THE TRUTH.**

The Times-Union is largely responsible for the defeat of the drainage amendment, and this responsibility will be a heavy load for it to carry.

It cannot say that it defeated it because it conscientiously believed **THAT IT WAS RIGHT TO DEFEAT IT**; it will be forced to acknowledge that it waged the successful war on it **AT THE COMMAND OF ITS OWNERS**, whose interests, material and political, lay in the defeat of this measure.

The trustees can get that sustaining force in their disappointment over the defeat of their plan, that comes to those whose conscience is clear.

The Times-Union will have served to it a dish composed of the fruits gathered on the banks of the Dead Sea.

At the time that this is written it has not been my privilege to see the Jacksonville carnival, owned and operated by my brethren, Messrs. Carter, Wilson and Hollomon. Therefore, I cannot say whether the attractions of the carnival come up to the glowing accounts given in the Times-Union and the Metropolis.

I WILL, however, make a personal inspection of the carnival and will go there with the expectation of being amused and entertained.

The three gentlemen who have incorporated themselves for the purpose of giving amusement to the people as a means of adding to the incomes which they enjoy from their journalistic enterprises, which journalistic enterprises, on account of the greater glory reflected upon them by the wonders that their own descriptions say they have brought together for the amazement and awe of the populace, have become small potatoes indeed, should by this time be able to present a very creditable show.

They have had considerable practice in the gay and festive showman's art.

It is true that Horace Greeley was contented to be known to fame as an humble editor and did not care for the greater glory to be obtained in the sawdust arena.

It is not to be denied that the elder Dana, old man Bennett, the venerable McClure, the fiery Watterson, the revered Grady and a host of other editors, past and present, were content with their respective lots as journalists, lowly tho' they were, and did not raise their eyes to the dizzy heights of fame vouchsafed to those who climb up on the high place reared for him who is **MAIN GAZABO** of things housed in tents.

But this is no reason why, our own **EDITORS-IN-CHIEF** should be bound down to the lowly limits of literary fame.

Let those be content with ordinary fame in whom the fires of ambition smoulder.

Whoso pants for fame that never dies—

THE SHOW BUSINESS FOR HIS!

Compare the fame of Barnum with Bacon; of Sells with Shakespeare; of Hagenbach with Herodotus.

And the thing is as plain as a ton of coal lumped on a snowbank.

Millions knew Barnum who never heard of Bacon, except as a breakfast dish, and more people have envied the glory of Sells and Hagenbach than have heard of the death of the other two gentlemen.

So, I for one don't blame the **EDITORS-IN-CHIEF** of Florida's famous and foremost dailies for laying aside the fatiguing Fabers to assume the glittering garb of the showman proud of his lofty calling.

And if the plaudits of a plentifully pleased people reach the ears of **THESE OUR OWN SHOWMEN** as they have reached those of the Barnums, the Baileys, the Sells, the Robinsons and the rest.

It is no more than they deserve.

Let no "miserable knocker" try to wrest this fame from **THESE SHOWMEN.** He cannot do it.

If they have pulled off a good show, they deserve it, and they will get it. For the amused populace will write their verdict and proclaim Messrs. Carter, Wilson and Hollomon—

GOOD SHOWMEN.

What can mortal men desire beyond this?

Cotton is Cash.

At a recent convention of the American Bankers' Association, held at St. Louis, Mr. Charles J. Haden of the Atlanta bar delivered an address under the title, "A Plea for the Cotton Fields."

It was a splendid address, of peculiar interest to the people of the South.

His presentation of the importance of the cotton industry is enough to make more brightly burn the fires of patriotism in the breast of everyone who lives in the South.

That the cotton industry is important has long been known, but it is seldom that the people interested have the opportunity of getting a presentation of its importance in such attractive shape as that of Mr. Haden's address.

He says that the cotton growers have not been fairly treated by the banks; that every year there is a scarcity of money to move the crop.

Having a commodity that is the most sought after of any in the country or in the world, it is difficult for the producers to handle their business because of the restricted amount of money available to market it.

I quote from Mr. Haden's address:

"Why should we need to send our money to Eastern banks nine months in the year to gain their good will that they should lend it back to us in the harvest season to handle a crop for which the gold of the earth beckons? Is it prudent or just that any one city or section should by approval of the government financially dominate all other cities and sections? Five hundred million dollars is required in the South every year, within a period of about three months, to handle this crop. We want the fullest measure of independence that conditions justify.

"So universal is the consumption of cotton that in strange lands among strange tongues, where your government bonds would not be collateral for a breakfast, this white fiber of the cotton fields is sought and bought and woven and worn. Gold, from Copenhagen to Valparaiso, goes in search of it as easily as the medieval knight went in search of the Holy Grail."

The South raises a commodity that is more certain to produce cash than any other commodity needed by man. There is a **WORLD HUNGER** for cotton that makes its sale **AS CERTAIN AS IT IS READY TO BE OFFERED.**

There is no sense in the cotton growers being restricted for money to move this crop.

Instead of the government lending its money to the **GAMBLING BANKS IN WALL STREET** it should place its money at the disposal of the world's **GREATEST CASH COMMODITY.**